UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,927	11/06/2000	David D. Kloba	1933.0010009	8134

82515   7590   03/26/2010
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER
FABER, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 December 2009*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7,9-13,16,18-22,25,27-29 and 34-41* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) *38-40* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7,9-13,16,18-22,25,27-29,34-37 and 41* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/1/10*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed

on 15 December 2009 and the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1 March 2010.

This office action is made Non Final.

2.   Claims 1, 9, 18, 19, and 27-29 have been amended.

3.   Claim 30 has been canceled by the Applicant.

4.   Claim 41 has been added.

5.   The objection to Claim 30 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment. The rejection to Claim 30, under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, has

been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claim 30, under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al in further in view of Barron in

further view of Burkett et al in further view of Lindsay et al in further view of Gerald et al

has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

6.   Claims 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, 25, and 27-30, 34-41 are pending. Claims 38-40

have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-30 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

7.   The information disclosure statement filed 1 March 2010 fails to comply with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the IDS fails to disclose the

publication date of NPL1. While the IDS discloses the date the page was visited by a

user, it appears NPL1 was published before 2006 according to the copyright date listed

on the provided copy of NPL1 . It has been placed in the application file, but the

information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is

advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this

information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the

date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based

on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements

under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9.   Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

possession of the claimed invention.

10.   Claim 41 recites the limitation "storing at least said document in a first memory,

wherein said first memory is non-writable memory, and wherein said document cannot

be modified from said first memory". However, the Examiner is unable to locate any

disclosure in a clear, written description within the specification stating the limitation

when reviewing the specification. Furthermore, since this feature is not described in the

specification for the instant application, the examiner is forced to make a broad

interpretation for this feature.

11.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12.   Claim 9, 18, 27, 34 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13.   Claims 9, 18, and 27 recites the limitation "respective instance methods" in line 8,

7, 12, respectively. Examiner is unsure if this instance methods is a new element or

depending on instance methods in line(s) 5, 4-5, 7,of Claim 9, 10, and 19, respectively .

Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14.   Claim 34 recites the limitation "an instance method" in line 8. Examiner is unsure

if this instance methods is a new element or depending on instance methods in line(s) ,

4-5 of Claim 34. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim.

15.   Claim 34 recites the limitation "a respective object pointer" in line 7. Examiner is

unsure if this respective object pointer is a new element or depending on each object

pointer in line(s) 1 of Claim 34. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this

limitation in the claim.

16.   Claim 41 recites the limitation "storing at least said document in a first memory,

wherein said first memory is non-writable memory, and wherein said document cannot

be modified from said first memory". It is unclear to the Examiner how data can be

stored, therefore written, to a memory if the memory is non-writable. If a memory is or

set to be non-writable, then data cannot be written to that memory. Thus, its unclear to

the Examiner how a is stored, therefore written, to a memory if the memory is non-

writable. Therefore, Claim 41 is vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18.   Claims 1-3, 7, 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in

further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999)

As per independent Claim 1, Whitledge et al discloses a method comprising:

- Determining display and memory parameters of a device based on device

  information (e.g., Column 8, lines 5-15: Discloses obtaining device-conversion

  preferences that are to be used to convert an original electronic document

  into converted electronic document that would allow it to be displayed on a

  smaller display with a lower resolution, which includes a PDA (Column 21,

  lines 1-2) The device-conversion preferences would inherently describe the

  specifications of the display screen of the device which in other words,

  disclose the resolution, memory, screen size and video information.)

- Parsing requesting content into a document having a plurality of objects; laying out said document according to said display and memory parameters of said device. (Column 8, lines 19-27: Discloses converting content, wherein content includes objects such as text, images, video, audio, based on preferences into a document. One embodiment includes parsing content into a document that includes converting the content based on the conversion preferences. (Column 23, lines 9-40; FIG 8B)

- Generating a document table for said document, wherein said document table includes object pointers corresponding to respective objects of the plurality of objects, wherein each object pointer includes an attribute pointer that points to a respective object in said content stream;. (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents. These references are viewed as pointers to the elements (objects), wherein an reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points to a respective object.)

- transmitting said content stream to said device and said device receives said content stream. (Column 8, lines 29-34, 40-47)

Whitledge et al discloses converting a original electronic document that contains content into a converted electronic document based on conversion preferences. However, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose the original electronic document contains a plurality of pages. On the other hand, it was well-known to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that a document may contain more
than one page within it. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to
have modified Whitledge et al's document to contain more than one pages since it
would have provided the benefit of keeping single page document related to each other
in one location and reducing the number of total documents which would prevent
documents relating to each other being lost or misplaced.

Furthermore, Whitledge fails to especially disclose uses an attribute pointer that
points to an object of said document included in said content stream to selectively
access and copy said object from said content stream to a writable memory of said
device, thereby enabling modification of said object without copying said entire
document to said writable memory of said device, and wherein said attribute pointer is
part of an object pointer from said document table in said content stream. On the other
hand, Whitledge discloses the functionality for a user to receive a document onto a
device wherein one or more elements can be extracted from the document through the
use a DOM of the received document. Once extracted, an element is converted by
using data mining operations. By extracting one of the elements, it "coping" the element
from the document into a separate temporary memory, i.e. a memory buffer, (a form of
writable memory) to be converted (i.e. modified). (Column 25, lines 50-64; Column 31,
lines 1-5; Col 33, lines 4-10) Furthermore, Whitledge discloses the functionality of
references to the selected elements (pointers to the element) are saved into a symbol
table so they can used in other expression or documents. These references are viewed

as pointers to the elements (objects), wherein an reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points to a respective object.) (Column 24, lines 35-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that allow a user on a device to convert extracted elements from a document since it would have provided the benefit of presenting the elements into a desired format suitable for display on the device.

In addition, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose inputting said document and a document table into a content stream. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which the streamed objects are known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Thus, pointers remain intact and are presented in the stream. Furthermore, Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content stream. (Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data. Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel.

(Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whitledge et al discloses an embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24, lines 9- Column 25, lines 67) Thus in conjunction with Whitledge, a document table containing object references (pointers to elements) are processed, thus remaining intact during Burkett's serialization into a serial data (content stream) Thus, the pointers are presented in the stream.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Burkett's method since Burkett et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more efficiently processed.

As per dependent Claim 2, Claims 2 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Whitledge et al discloses a method wherein said object-by-object basis corresponds to distinguishable pieces of request content. (Column 21, line 11 - Column 23, lines 40; FIG 8B: Discloses different objects, text and images, are identified as text and images making them distinguishable.)

As per dependent Claim 3, Whitledge et al discloses a method wherein said document table provides points of reference to the objects of said document content (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents.

As per dependent Claim 7, Whitledge et al discloses said storing said content stream to a mobile device. (Column 8, lines 29-34; 40-47: Discloses receiving a converted document wherein when the document is received, its inherently saved to temporary memory buffer for further operation.)

As per independent claim 10, Claim 10 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent claim 19, Claim 19 recites a computer program product... for performing the method of Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

19.   Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et

al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further in view of Barron (US Patent

#6,665,709, filed 3/27/2000).

As per dependent Claim 4, Whitledge et al discloses compressing said document

content (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses image size being reduced or compressed of

its original size to be able to meet the conversion preferences.)

However, Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett fail to specifically disclose

encrypting said document content. However, Barron discloses a method of encrypting

electronic data into an encrypted data packet. (Column 6, Claim 1, line 48-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett 's

methods with Barron's method since Barron's method would have facilitated virtually

impregnable security for the delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files.

As per dependent claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and

is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 22, Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and

is similarly rejected under rationale.

20.   Claims 9, 18, 27, 34-36, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further

view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay

et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998)

As per dependent claim 9, Claim 9 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale. In addition, Whitledge discloses modifying an object (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses content, such as image, being altered or modify to accustom to the PDA device conversion preferences during the process being received by the PDA.) Furthermore, Whitledge and Burkett fail to specifically disclose wherein said object pointer further comprises a vtable pointer for accessing instance methods associated with said object. However, Lindsay et al discloses a relational table mapping within object oriented system wherein the table is mapped (pointing) to an attribute object and associated get/set methods associated the attribute object. (Col 3, line 67-Col 4, line 10) Thus, Lindsay et al discloses a pointer pointing to an object (attribute object), a form of an attribute pointer, and another pointer pointing to access a instance method associated with the object (get/set methods), a form of a vtable pointer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al and Burkett's method with Lindsay et al's methods since Lindsay et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein the object oriented system retains flexibility to accommodate changes and increases efficiency.

Furthermore, Whitledge et al, Burkett et al and Lindsay et al fail to specifically disclose copying said object to a writable memory space, altering said copied object with respective instance methods accessed using said vtable pointer and updating an

attribute pointer of said object pointer to the writable memory space of said object that has been altered. However, Gerard et al discloses updating an object by making a copy of the object in memory (thus new memory space for modification) wherein the object is updated (altered) by different called methods through the use of a table pointer, and the data pointer (points to the object data (Col 5, lines 20-21) is updated to point to from data section of the original object to the data section of the copied object. (Col 7, line 45 – Col 8, line 10; Col 8, line 63-66; Col 9, lines 45-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett 's methods with Gerald et al's method since Gerald et al would have provided the benefit of an efficient and less costly method of updating persistent objects in an object oriented computer system.

As per dependent claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependents claims 34-36, Claims 34-36 recite similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 41, Claim 41 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

21.   Claims 28-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further in view of Barron

(US Patent #6,665,709, filed 3/27/2000) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent

#6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed

12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000;

filed on 4/7/1998).

As per independent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1

and 9 are similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Whitledge et al discloses a

method comprising:

- Parsing requesting content into a document having a plurality of discrete

  objects, each discrete object having a format based on at least said display

  and memory parameters. (Column 8, lines 19-27: Discloses converting

  content, wherein content includes objects such as text, images, video, audio,

  based on preferences into a document. One embodiment includes parsing

  content into a document that includes converting the content based on the

  conversion preferences. (Column 23, lines 9-40; FIG 8B)

- Generating a document table based on said object-by-object basis for said

  document content. (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment

  where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references

  (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in

  other expression or documents.

- compressing said document content according to said object-by-object basis

  (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses image size being reduced or compressed

  of its original size to be able to meet the conversion preferences.)

- modifying an object of the plurality of objects, wherein said object

  corresponds to distinguishable pieces of said requested content. (Column 23,

  lines 9-54: Discloses content, such as image, being altered or modify to

  accustom to the PDA device conversion preferences during the process being

  received by the PDA.)

However, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose encrypting said document

content according to said object-by-object basis. However, Barron discloses a method

of encrypting electronic data into an encrypted data packet. (Column 6, Claim 1, line 48-

49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Barron's method since

Barron's method would have facilitated virtually impregnable security for the delivery,

storage and sharing of documents and files.

Whitledge et al and Barron fail to specifically disclose inputting said document

content into a content stream according to said object-by-object basis wherein said

content stream includes the plurality of objects, and inputting said document table into

said content stream according to said object-by-object basis, wherein said document

and said document table form said content stream according to said mobile device

information. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and

having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which the streamed objects are known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Furthermore, Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content stream. (Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data. Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whitledge et al discloses an embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24, lines 9- Column 25, lines 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Barron's methods since Burkett et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more efficiently processed.

As per independent claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 28 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

22.   Claims 37 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998) in further view of Fallon (US Patent 6,309,424; filed on 11/3/2000; continuation of App 09/210491, filed 12/11/1998)

As per dependent claim 37, Whitledge, Burkett, Lindsay, and Gerald failed to specifically disclose decompressing the object. However, Fallon discloses a well-known method of decompressing data (i.e. object) within a compressed data stream. (FIG 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Burkett, Lindsay, and Gerald with Fallon's disclosure of decompressing data since it would have provided the benefit of reversing the compressed data for the user to access the data as it was originally created.

Response to Arguments

23.   Applicant's arguments filed 15 December 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

24.   On page 13, in regards to the IDS filed 17 June 2009, the Applicant requests the Examiner reconsider the reference, a book titled Delivery Push, and withdraw the

previous objection of the IDS wherein the Applicant submitted the entire book as being relevant and to comply with 37 CFR 1.56. However, the Examiner disagrees.

The Applicant has stated the entire book, Delivery Push, is relevant to the case. In response, due to the massive amount of the pages of the book and no summary of relevance by the Applicant, the Examiner would require a large amount of time and resources to review the entire book to understand the book's relevance in which the Examiner does not have. Therefore, it produces an extreme burden on the Examiner to evaluate its relevance to the claimed invention there was no concise explanation (i.e. summary; pointing out the relevant pages and lines from the book for the Examiner) The Examiner points to 609.04(a) stating "*Concise explanations (especially those which point out the relevant pages and lines) are helpful to the Office, particularly where documents are lengthy and complex and applicant is aware of a section that is highly relevant to patentability or where a large number of documents are submitted and applicant is aware that one or more are highly relevant to patentability*) Providing a concise explanation of the book would help the Examiner greatly in enabling to consider this reference.

25.   On page 14, in regards to Claims 9, 18 and 27, Applicant respectfully submits claim 9 clearly indicates that the "respective instance methods" are instance methods respective to "said object" that can be accessed using "said vtable pointer," i.e., two or more instance methods of the "instance methods associated with said object.". As a

result, Applicant states "respective instance methods" has antecedent basis. However,

the Examiner disagrees.

According to Claim 9, lines 5-6, states "a vtable pointer for accessing instance

methods associated with said object"; wherein lines 8-9, states the "altering said copied

object with respective instance methods accessed using said vtable pointer". In other

words, lines 8-9 states using said vtable pointers the instance methods associated with

said object, now copied; however, the claim language of lines 8-9 doesn't clearly state

the instance methods disclosed in the claim language of line 8-9 are the same instance

methods disclosed in the claim language lines 5-6. Therefore, Examiner is unsure if this

instance methods is a new element or depending on instance methods in line(s) 5, 4-5,

7,of Claim 9, 10, and 19, respectively . Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for

this limitation in the claim.

26.   On page 15, in regards to Claim 34, Applicant submits *the "respective object*

pointer" is an object pointer respective to the "object of the plurality of objects."

Furthermore, the "instance method" is an instance associated respective to the "object

of the plurality of objects" that can be accessed using a vtable pointer included in the

"respective object pointer." Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the features of "an

instance method" and "a respective object pointer" have antecedent basis, in claim 34.

However, the Examiner disagrees.

According to the claim language of Claim 34, Lines 3-4 discloses an instance

method associated with the (corresponding) object, wherein lines 8-9 discloses an

instance method associated with the object. Based on the claim language, there is no clear evidence that the instance method stated in lines 8-9 is based on the object from "object of the plurality of objects" disclosed in line 5. Thus, Examiner is unsure if this instance method is a new element or depending on instance methods in line(s) 4-5 that already presents an instance method. In addition, Line 1 discloses a object pointer, wherein lines 6-7 discloses a respective object pointer. Based on the claim language, there is no clear evidence that the instance method stated in lines 6-7 is respective to the object from "object of the plurality of objects" disclosed in line 5. Thus, Examiner is unsure if this object pointer is a new element or depending on the object pointer in line(s) 1 that already presents an object pointer. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

27.   On pages 15-16, in regards to Claim 34, Applicant states *the vtable pointer is not required to point to an instance method so that it can be used "to access an instance method associated with the object," as recited in claim 34. Indeed, in an exemplary embodiment, the vtable pointer can be used to access an entry in a vtable, and that entry can be used to access a function pointer that points to the instance method. Thus, the feature of "using the vtable pointer to access an instance method associated with the object," as recited in claim 34 is clear.* However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

According to the claim language of the limitation, Line 2 of Claim 34 says the vtable pointer points to an entry in a vtable, and an entry contains a function pointer that

points to an instance method. In order for the vtable pointer to access the instance

method, the vtable pointer must access the entry's function pointer within the vtable to

access an instance method, in which the claim language of lines 8-9 does not

specifically disclose. Thus, based on the claim language of the limitation, its unclear to

the Examiner how the vtable pointer accesses an instance method without the use of

the function pointer that was disclosed a few lines above. Thus, based on the claim

limitations of Claim 34, a vtable pointer does not point to an instance method, thus it

cannot access an instance method; only a function pointer that points to an instance

method can access the method. Thus, Claim 34 is viewed as vague and indefinite.

28.   On page 19, in regards to Claim 1 and its parallel claims, Applicant argues that

the combination of applied references fail to specifically teach: (1) Generating a

document table having pointers that point to objects in a content stream. However, the

Examiner disagrees.

        Based on Applicant's argument, it appears that the Applicant is arguing that the

applied references do not teach the limitations: "*generating a document table for said*

document; inputting said document and said document table into a content stream,

wherein said document table includes object pointers corresponding to respective

objects of the plurality of objects, wherein each object pointer includes an attribute

pointer that points to a respective object in said content stream;" In response, Whitledge

et al discloses an embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext

elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can

used in other expression or documents. These references are viewed as pointers to the

elements (objects), wherein an reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points to a

respective object. However, the Examiner agrees, that Whitledge et al fails to

specifically disclose inputting said document and a document table into a content

stream. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and

having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which the streamed objects are

known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are

processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4,

line 2) Thus, pointers remain intact and are presented in the stream. Furthermore,

Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or fragments of a

document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized binary format,

thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content stream. (Abstract, lines 5-

10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content stream when the

fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data. Furthermore, when the

document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then serialized, it begins with

the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the lower-level tree nodes.

Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined order by levels as it

starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into lower levels. When

finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel. (Column 3, lines 1-26;

line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whitledge et al discloses an embodiment in by parsing a

document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table comprising object references

before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24, lines 9- Column 25, lines 67)

Thus in conjunction with Whitledge, a document table containing object references

(pointers to elements) are processed, thus remaining intact during Burkett's serialization

into a serial data (content stream) Thus, the pointers are presented in the stream.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's

invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Burkett's method since Burkett et al's

method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more

efficiently processed. Therefore, Whitledge and Burkett teaches the limitations.

On page 19, in regards to Claim 1 and its parallel claims, Applicant argues that

the combination of applied references fail to specifically teach: (2) Transmitting a

content stream having objects and pointers to the objects, where the receiving device

uses an attribute pointer from the content stream to access and copy an object from the

content stream to writable memory of the device. Such functionality enables the

receiving device to modify the copied object without copying the entire document from

the content stream to the writable memory of said device. However, the Examiner

disagrees.

Based on Applicant's argument, it appears that the Applicant is arguing that the

applied references do not teach the limitations: *"wherein said device receives said*

content stream and uses an attribute pointer that points to an object of said document

included in said content stream to selectively access and copy said object from said

content stream to a writable memory of said device, thereby enabling modification of

said object without copying said entire document to said writable memory of said

device, and wherein said attribute pointer is part of an object pointer from said

document table in said content stream."

According to the claim language of the claim limitation, it states the device

receives said content stream wherein the document and table are apart of the stream

(disclosed in previous limitation). Since the stream was received by the device, the data

is now fully stored on the device. Therefore, the document and document table is fully

stored on the device. Therefore, based on the claim language of the limitation,

Whitledge fails to especially disclose uses an attribute pointer that points to an object of

said document included in said content stream to selectively access and copy said

object from said content stream to a writable memory of said device, thereby enabling

modification of said object without copying said entire document to said writable

memory of said device, and wherein said attribute pointer is part of an object pointer

from said document table in said content stream. On the other hand, Whitledge

discloses the functionality for a user to receive a document onto a device wherein one

or more elements can be extracted from the document through the use a DOM of the

received document. Once extracted, an element is converted by using data mining

operations. By extracting one of the elements, it "coping" the element from the

document into a separate temporary memory, i.e. a memory buffer, (a form of writable

memory) to be converted (i.e. modified). (Column 25, lines 50-64; Column 31, lines 1-5;

Col 33, lines 4-10) Furthermore, Whitledge discloses the functionality of references to

the selected elements (pointers to the element) are saved into a symbol table so they

can used in other expression or documents. These references are viewed as pointers to

the elements (objects), wherein an reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points

to a respective object.) (Column 24, lines 35-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention that allow a user on a device to convert extracted elements from a

document since it would have provided the benefit of presenting the elements into a

desired format suitable for display on the device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751.

The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/William L. Bashore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175